arXiv:1511.08579v1 [hep-ph] 27 Nov 2015

Magnetic moments of $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^+$ decuplet baryons using statistical model

Amanpreet Kaur, Alka Upadhyay
School of Physics and Material Science,
Thapar University, Patiala, Punjab-147004
E-mail: amanpreet.kaur9074@yahoo.com, alka.iisc@gmail.com

Abstract

A suitable wave function for baryon decuplet is framed with inclusion of sea containing quark-gluon Fock states. Relevant operator formalism is applied to calculate magnetic moments of $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^+$ baryon decuplet. Statistical model assumes decomposition of baryonic state in various quark-gluon Fock states such as $|qqq\rangle|g\rangle, |qqq\rangle|gg\rangle, |qqq\rangle|ggg\rangle$ with possibility gluon emitting $q\overline{q}$ pairs condensates due to the subprocesses like $g \Leftrightarrow q\overline{q}, g \Leftrightarrow gg$ and $g \Leftrightarrow qg$ where $q\overline{q} = u\overline{u}, d\overline{d}, s\overline{s}$. Statistical approach and detailed balance principle in combination is used to find the relative probabilities of these Fock states in flavor, spin and color space. The total number of partons (sea) in this formalism are restricted to three gluons due to limited free energy of gluon and suppressed number of strange quark-antiquark pairs. The combined approach is used to calculate the magnetic moments, importance of strangeness in the sea (scalar, vector and tensor). Our approach has confirmed the scalar-tensor sea dominancy over vector sea. Various modifications in the model are used to check the validity of statistical approach. The results are matched with theoretical data available. Good consistency with the experimental data have been achieved for Δ^{++}, Δ^+ and Ω^-.

Keywords: Statistical Model, Detailed Balance, Magnetic Moments, Strange baryons

1 Introduction and Motivation

Recently, a new state of matter called "pentaquarks" ($uudc\overline{c}$) has been predicted at LHCb bringing a revolution in the study of baryon spectroscopy. The search from the LHCb was motivated by the prediction made by theoretical approaches. Besides this the prediction of lifetime of spin 3/2 heavy baryon state at CMS [1] helps us to explore their properties in a better way. Lot of progress has been observed in both theoretical and experimental approaches for the study of hadron properties since octet magnetic moments were predicted by Coleman and Glashow [2] about fifty years ago. These

predictions motivated theorist and experimentalist to measure baryon octet magnetic moments [3]. The experimental information about decuplet baryons is limited because they have short lifetimes so till now the experimental data of $\Delta^{++}, \Delta^{+}, \Omega^{-}$ is available so far [4-7]. The study about the properties of baryon constitute an important role for investigation of baryon structure. The advancements in the experimental facilities at CDF [8] etc. have become a subject of motivation to study baryon properties and hence its structure in the non perturbative regime of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD). The well known experiments like EMC (ElectronMuon Collaboration) and the SMC (Spin-Muon Collaboration)[9-10] studies the static properties of the hadrons.

The magnetic moments of baryon decuplet have been theoretically investigated using different approaches, such as: simple additive quark model in non relativistic limit which calculates the magnetic moments of the baryons as the sum of its constituent quark magnetic moments. Further improvements were done by including effects such as sea quark contributions [11], quark orbital momentum effects [12], SU(3) symmetry breaking effects [13]. Sogami and Ohyamaguchi [14], presented a concept of effective mass to calculate magnetic moments of baryons and later, Bains and Verma [15] used the concept of effective mass and screened charge of quarks to calculate magnetic moments. The subject of magnetic moments is bit difficult to explain or understand because this phenomenon of baryons is contributed from the magnetic moments of valence quarks as well as from various other complicated effects such as relativistic effects, contributions from pion cloud, confinement effect on quark masses, etc..

Recently, predictions based on a number of theoretical formalisms have been developed to calculate the magnetic moment of decuplet baryons. The relativistic quark model (RQM) [16], QCD-based quark model (QCDQM) [17], effective mass scheme (EMS) [18], light cone QCD sum rule (LCQSR) [19], QCD sum rule (QCDSR) [20], Skyrme model [21], chiral quark soliton model (CQSM) [22], chiral perturbation theory (χPT) [23], lattice QCD (LQCD) [24-25] etc. are few to name. Discrete methods are suggested in literature [11] which describes baryon to be composed of three valence quarks and sea composed of gluons and quark antiquark pairs which have studied the nucleonic properties like magnetic moments, weak decay coupling ratios, spin distributions by considering the contributions from sea as well.

The strange quark to non strange quark ratio: $\frac{2(s+\overline{s})}{(u+\overline{u}+d+\overline{d})} = 0.477 \pm 0.063 \pm 0.053$[26] predicted by the NuTeV Collaboration at FermiLab shows the presence of strange quarks in sea. The contributions of strange quark to the nucleonic form factors is negligible as suggested by the collaborations HAPPEX and GO [27-29] and some theoretical studies as well. Later R.Bijker et al. [30] suggested that contribution of strange quarkantiquark pair is very less (-0.0004μ_N) to magnetic moment of the nucleon.

To calculate the magnetic moments of baryon decuplet particles , we assume the baryon to be comprising of valence part and a virtual sea consisting of quark antiquark pairs multiconnected by gluons. In sec. II, a suitable wavefunction is framed for baryon decuplet having color, flavor and spin space. Here, valence q^3 and a sea combines in a way to reproduce desired quantum numbers of

the decuplets i.e. spin 3/2, color singlet and flavor 10. Sec. III shows the application of magnetic moment operator to the total wavefunction on flavor and spin space. Principle of detail balance and statistical approach is applied in combination to find the relative probabilities in spin, flavor and color states in sec. IV. Here, the detailed balance is used to put a constraint $(1-C_l)^{n-1}$ on sea to be taking up $s\overline{s}$ pair due to their heavy masses in terms of on respective baryons. Various modifications in the statistical model is studied in sec.V. In sec. VI, the calculated results have been analyzed and matched with the theoretical models and experimental data.

2 Decuplet wave function with a sea component

The structure of hadron constitutes two parts i.e valence part (qqq) and other is sea part which consist of quark-antiquark pairs muticonnected through gluons (g,$q\overline{q}$) [31-32]. A q^3 state in the baryon are in the 1, 8 and 10 color states which means that sea should also be in corresponding states to form a color singlet baryon. The valence part of the hadronic wave function can be written as:

$$\Psi = \Phi(|\phi\rangle|\chi\rangle|\psi\rangle)(|\xi\rangle) \tag{2.1}$$

where $|\phi\rangle, |\chi\rangle, |\psi\rangle$ and $|\xi\rangle$ denote flavor, spin, color and space q^3 wave functions and their contribution make total wave function antisymmetric in nature. Here, spatial part ($|\xi\rangle$) is symmetric under the exchange of any two quarks for the lowest lying hadrons and therefore the flavor-spin-color part $\Phi(|\phi\rangle|\chi\rangle|\psi\rangle)$ should be antisymmetric in nature such that when combined with ($|\xi\rangle$) gives antisymmetry of the total wave function.

Sea considered here is in S-wave state with spin (0,1,2) and color (1,8,$\overline{10}$) and is assumed to be flavorless . Let $H_{0,1,2}$ and $G_{1,8,\overline{10}}$ denote spin and color sea wave functions, which satisfy $\langle H_i|H_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$, $\langle G_k|G_l\rangle = \delta_{kl}$. In this approach we have assumed a sea to be consist of two gluons or $q\overline{q}q\overline{q}$ pairs and different possible states for them can be written as:

$$\textbf{Spin} : uud : 1/2 \otimes 1/2 \otimes 1/2 = 2(1/2) \oplus 3/2$$
$$gg : 1 \otimes 1 = 0_s \oplus 1_a \oplus 2_s$$
$$q\overline{q}q\overline{q} : (1/2 \otimes 1/2) \otimes (1/2 \otimes 1/2) = (0_a \oplus 1_s) \otimes (0_a \oplus 1_s) = 2(0_s) \oplus 1_s \oplus 2(1_a) \oplus 2_s$$

$$\textbf{Color} : uud : 3 \otimes 3 \otimes 3 = 1_a \oplus 8_{ms} \oplus 8_{ma} \oplus 10_s$$
$$gg : 8 \otimes 8 = 1_s \oplus 8_s \oplus 8_a \oplus 10_a \oplus \overline{10}_a \oplus 27_s$$
$$q\overline{q}q\overline{q} : (3 \otimes \overline{3}) \otimes (3 \otimes \overline{3}) = (1_a \oplus 8_s) \otimes (1_a \oplus 8_s)$$
$$= 2(1_s) \oplus 2(8_s) \oplus 2(8_a) \oplus 10_s \oplus \overline{10}_s \oplus 27_s$$

Subscripts s and a denotes symmetry and antisymmetry on combining the states. We have assumed in our model that gluon and $q\overline{q}$ carry same quantum numbers. Total antisymmetry of the baryon

should be kept in mind while combining the valence and sea part. In general, the symmetry property arise when (S+S),(A+A) combines and antisymmetry comes into play when (S+A) combination is formed.

So,the possible combinations of valence q^3 and sea wave functions which can yield spin 3/2, flavor decuplet and color singlet state thereby maintaining the anti symmetrization of the total baryonic wave function are:

$$\Phi_1^{(3/2)}H_0G_1, \Phi_1^{(3/2)}H_1G_1, \Phi_1^{(1/2)}H_1G_8, \Phi_1^{(3/2)}H_2G_1, \Phi_8^{(1/2)}H_2G_8 \tag{2.2}$$

The total flavor-spin-color wave function of a spin up baryon decuplet consisting of three valence quarks and a sea component can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}|\Phi_{3/2}^{(\uparrow)}\rangle = \frac{1}{N}[a_0\Phi_1^{(3/2\uparrow)}H_0G_1 + b_1(\Phi_1^{(3/2)}\otimes H_1)^{\uparrow}G_1 + b_8(\Phi_1^{(1/2)}\otimes H_1)^{\uparrow}G_8 + \\ d_1(\Phi_1^{(3/2)}\otimes H_2)^{\uparrow}G_1 + d_8(\Phi_8^{(1/2)}\otimes H_2)^{\uparrow}G_8]\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

$$N^2 = a_0^2 + b_1^2 + b_8^2 + d_1^2 + d_8^2 \tag{2.4}$$

where N is the normalization constant. The first term in the equation (2.3) is obtained by combining q^3 wave function with spin 0 (scalar sea) and next two terms are obtained by coupling q^3 with spin 1(vector sea) such that:

$$(\Phi_1^{(3/2)}\otimes H_1)^{\uparrow} \equiv \phi_{b1}^{(3/2\uparrow)}\psi_1^A, \tag{2.5}$$

$$(\Phi_1^{(1/2)}\otimes H_1)^{\uparrow} \equiv \phi_{b8}^{(1/2\uparrow)}\psi_1^{MS}, \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\phi_{b1}^{(3/2\uparrow)} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}H_{1,0}F_S^{(3/2\uparrow)} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}H_{1,1}F_S^{(1/2\uparrow)} \tag{2.7}$$

$$\phi_{b8}^{(1/2\uparrow)} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}H_{1,0}F_S^{(3/2\uparrow)} - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}H_{1,1}F_S^{(1/2\uparrow)} \tag{2.8}$$

The q^3 wave functions in equation (2.5-2.6) for a flavor decuplet baryon can be written as:

$$\Phi_1^{(3/2)} \equiv \Phi(10, 3/2, 1) = F_S\Psi_1^A \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$F_S = \phi^{\lambda}\chi^{\lambda} \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$\Phi_1^{(1/2)} \equiv \Phi(10, 1/2, 1) = F_{MS}\Psi_1^A \tag{2.11}$$

$$\Phi_8^{(1/2)} \equiv \Phi(10, 1/2, 8) = F_A\phi_8^S \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$F_{MS} = \phi^{\lambda}\chi^{MS} \tag{2.13}$$

$$F_A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\chi^{\lambda}\psi^{\rho} - \chi^{\rho}\psi^{\lambda}) \tag{2.14}$$

Here, superscripts S and A denote total symmetry and antisymmetry and λ , MS denotes symmetry and mixed symmetry under quark permutations $q_1 \leftrightarrow q_2$. $\Phi_1^{3/2}$ denotes a function with spin 3/2, color singlet and 10 represents flavor part. This function can be written as combination of F_s (denotes flavor and spin) and Ψ_1^A (represents color of baryons and is antisymmetric). For F_s to be symmetric, ϕ and χ should be symmetric in nature. Similarly, other functions like $\Phi_1^{1/2}$ and $\Phi_8^{1/2}$ denotes a function with spin 1/2 and flavor 10 with color singlet and octet respectively. Each wave function is a combination of symmetric and antisymmetric term such that total wave function becomes antisymmetric in nature.

The final two terms are result of coupling with spin 2 (tensor sea). Their expressions can be written as:

$$(\Phi_1^{(3/2)} \otimes H_2)^{\uparrow} \equiv \phi_{d1}^{(3/2\uparrow)}\psi_1^A, \tag{2.15}$$

$$(\Phi_8^{(1/2)} \otimes H_2)^{\uparrow} \equiv \phi_{d8}^{(1/2\uparrow)}\phi_8^S, \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$\phi_{d1}^{(3/2\uparrow)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}}H_{2,0}F_S^{(3/2\uparrow)} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}H_{2,1}F_S^{(1/2\uparrow)} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}H_{2,2}F_S^{(1/2\downarrow)} \tag{2.17}$$

$$\phi_{d8}^{(1/2\uparrow)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}}H_{2,0}F_A^{(3/2\uparrow)} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}H_{2,1}F_A^{(1/2\uparrow)} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}H_{2,2}F_A^{(1/2\downarrow)} \tag{2.18}$$

Wave functions $\phi_{b1}^{(3/2\uparrow)}$,$\phi_{b8}^{(1/2\uparrow)}$,$\phi_{d1}^{(3/2\uparrow)}$,$\phi_{d8}^{(1/2\uparrow)}$ are the functions written by taking coupling between spin of sea part and flavor part of q^3 wave function. The coefficients associated with each term contains the information about magnetic moments, spin distribution among valence quarks and needs to be determined statistically. The parameter a_0 come from a spin 3/2 of q^3 state coupled to spin 0 (scalar) of sea, b_1,b_8 comes when spin 3/2 and 1/2 of q^3 state is coupled to spin 1 (vector)of sea and d_1,d_8 corresponds coupling of spin 3/2 to spin 2 (tensor) of sea. The idea of different coefficients for each baryon wave function of the baryon decuplet comes from the fact that each baryon have different mass and quark content.

3 Magnetic Moments

Magnetic moments is a property of hadrons observed at low energies and long distances. Magnetic moments are contributed by all constituents of baryon (valence+sea) contributes by experiencing the same magnetic field. Thus, for baryons at ground state, the magnetic moments is a vector sum of quark magnetic moments,

$$\mu_{baryon} = \sum_{i=1,2,3} \mu_i\sigma_i \tag{3.1}$$

where σ_i is the pauli matrix representing the spin term of i^{th} quark and μ_i represents magnitude of quark magnetic moments and therefore values of magnetic moments are different for different baryons. Also,

$$\mu_{baryon} = \mu_i = \frac{e_i}{2m_i} \tag{3.2}$$

for i = u,d,s and e_i represents the quark charge. Present work shows the calculation of magnetic moments of $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^+$ by applying the magnetic moment operator ($\widehat{O} = \mu_i\sigma_i$) to the baryon wave function in a way:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi^{\uparrow}_{3/2}|\widehat{O}|\Phi^{\uparrow}_{3/2}\rangle = \frac{1}{N^2}[a_0^2\Phi_1^{(3/2\uparrow)}|\widehat{O}|\Phi_1^{(3/2\uparrow)}\rangle + b_1^2\Phi_1^{(3/2\uparrow)}|\widehat{O}|\Phi_1^{(3/2\uparrow)}\rangle \\ +b_8^2\Phi_1^{(1/2\uparrow)}|\widehat{O}|\Phi_1^{(1/2\uparrow)}\rangle + d_1^2\Phi_1^{(3/2\uparrow)}|\widehat{O}|\Phi_1^{(3/2\uparrow)}\rangle + d_8^2\Phi_8^{(1/2\uparrow)}|\widehat{O}|\Phi_8^{(1/2\uparrow)}\rangle]\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

The magnetic moment operator ($\widehat{O}$) which depends on flavor and spin of i^{th} quark can be applied on the baryon wave function in a following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi^{\uparrow}_{3/2}|\widehat{O}|\Phi^{\uparrow}_{3/2}\rangle = \frac{1}{N^2}[a_0\langle O_f^i\rangle^{\lambda\lambda}\langle\sigma_Z^i\rangle^{\lambda\uparrow\lambda\uparrow} + b_1\langle O_f^i\rangle^{\lambda\lambda}\langle\sigma_Z^i\rangle^{\lambda\uparrow\lambda\uparrow} + b_8\langle O_f^i\rangle^{\lambda\lambda}\langle\sigma_Z^i\rangle^{\lambda\uparrow\lambda\uparrow} \\ +d_1\langle O_f^i\rangle^{\lambda\lambda}\langle\sigma_Z^i\rangle^{\lambda\uparrow\lambda\uparrow} + d_8\langle O_f^i\rangle^{\lambda\lambda}\langle\sigma_Z^i\rangle^{\lambda\uparrow\lambda\uparrow}]\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Baryon	$\frac{\langle\Phi^{\uparrow}_{3/2}\|\widehat{O}\|\Phi^{\uparrow}_{3/2}\rangle}{N^2}$
Δ^{++}	$a_0^2(15\mu_u) + b_1^2(11\mu_u) + b_8^2(11\mu_u) + d_1^2(3\mu_u) + d_8^2(\frac{3}{2}\mu_u)$
Δ^{+}	$a_0^2(30\mu_u + 15\mu_d) + b_1^2(22\mu_u + 11\mu_d) + b_8^2(22\mu_u + 11\mu_d) + d_1^2(8\mu_u + \mu_d) + d_8^2(4\mu_u + \frac{1}{2}\mu_d)$
Δ^{0}	$a_0^2(30\mu_d + 15\mu_u) + b_1^2(22\mu_d + 11\mu_u) + b_8^2(22\mu_d + 11\mu_u) + d_1^2(8\mu_d + \mu_u) + d_8^2(4\mu_d + \frac{1}{2}\mu_u)$
Δ^{-}	$a_0^2(15\mu_d) + b_1^2(11\mu_d) + b_8^2(11\mu_d) + d_1^2(3\mu_d) + d_8^2(\frac{3}{2}\mu_d)$
Σ^{*+}	$a_0^2(30\mu_u + 15\mu_s) + b_1^2(22\mu_u + 11\mu_s) + b_8^2(22\mu_u + 11\mu_s) + d_1^2(8\mu_u + \mu_s) + d_8^2(4\mu_u + \frac{1}{2}\mu_s)$
Σ^{*0}	$a_0^2[5(\mu_u + \mu_d + \mu_s)] + b_1^2[\frac{11}{3}(\mu_u + \mu_d + \mu_s)] + b_8^2[\frac{11}{3}(\mu_u + \mu_d + \mu_s)] + d_1^2(\mu_u + \mu_d + \mu_s) + d_8^2[\frac{1}{2}(\mu_u + \mu_d + \mu_s)]$
Σ^{*-}	$a_0^2(30\mu_d + 15\mu_s) + b_1^2(22\mu_d + 11\mu_s) + b_8^2(22\mu_d + 11\mu_s) + d_1^2(8\mu_d + \mu_s) + d_8^2(4\mu_d + \frac{1}{2}\mu_s)$
Ξ^{*0}	$a_0^2(30\mu_s + 15\mu_u) + b_1^2(22\mu_s + 11\mu_u) + b_8^2(22\mu_s + 11\mu_u) + d_1^2(8\mu_s + \mu_u) + d_8^2(4\mu_s + \frac{1}{2}\mu_u)$
Ξ^{*-}	$a_0^2(30\mu_s + 15\mu_d) + b_1^2(22\mu_s + 11\mu_d) + b_8^2(22\mu_s + 11\mu_d) + d_1^2(8\mu_s + \mu_d) + d_8^2(4\mu_s + \frac{1}{2}\mu_d)$
Ω^{-}	$a_0^2(15\mu_s) + b_1^2(11\mu_s) + b_8^2(11\mu_s) + d_1^2(3\mu_s) + d_8^2(\frac{3}{2}\mu_s)$

Table 1: Expressions obtained after applying magnetic moment operator to baryon decuplet are shown:

where, $O_f^i = \frac{e^i}{2m_i}$ for magnetic moments. The values of quark magnetic moments predicted by quark model used in our approach are :

$$\mu_u = 1.852\mu_N, \mu_d = -0.972\mu_N, \mu_s = -0.613\mu_N \tag{3.5}$$

4 Principle of detailed balance and Statistical Model

Principle of detailed balance proposed by Zhang et al. [33-34] calculates the probability of Fock states present inside hadrons. Detailed balance principle demands equality between arriving in from one substate and leaving it. Hadron is treated to be consisting of complete set of quark gluon Fock states and can be expressed in expanded form as:

$$|B\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k} C_{i,j,k}|(q),(i,j,k),(l)\rangle \tag{4.1}$$

where q represents the valence quarks of the baryon , i is the number of quark-antiquark $u\overline{u}$ pairs, j is the number of quark-antiquark $d\overline{d}$ pairs , k is the number of gluons and l is the number of $s\overline{s}$ pairs in sea. The probability to find a quark-gluon Fock states is:

$$\rho_{i,j,k,l} = |C_{i,j,k,l}|^2, \tag{4.2}$$

and $\rho_{i,j,k,l}$ satisfies the normalization condition,

$$\sum_{i,j,k} \rho_{i,j,k,l} = 1 \tag{4.3}$$

Assumption of detailed balance principle is that every two subensembles balance with each other in a way:

$$\rho_{i,j,l,k}|(q),(i,j,l,k)\rangle \overset{balance}{\rightleftharpoons} \rho_{i',j',l',k'}|(q),(i^{'},j^{'},l^{'},k^{'}\rangle \tag{4.4}$$

The transfer between two Fock states has two ways: go-out rate and come in rate which is proportional to number of partons that may split and number of partons recombining respectively. The calculation of probability distributions includes various sub processes like $g \Leftrightarrow q\overline{q}$,$g \Leftrightarrow gg$,$q \Leftrightarrow qg$. Detailed balance principle is applied to Σ^{*0} to calculate probabilities and can be written as :

1. When $q \Leftrightarrow qg$ is considered: The general expression of probability can be written as:

$$|uds,i,j,l,k-1\rangle \underset{(3+2i+2j+2l)k}{\overset{3+2i+2j+2l}{\rightleftharpoons}} |uds,i,j,l,k\rangle \tag{4.5}$$

$$\frac{\rho_{i,j,l,k}}{\rho_{i,j,l,k-1}} = \frac{1}{k} \tag{4.6}$$

Here $\frac{\rho_{i,j,l,k}}{\rho_{i,j,l,k-1}}$ represents the probability ratios of two processes.

2. When both the processes $g \Leftrightarrow gg$ and $q \Leftrightarrow qg$ are included:

$$|uds, i, j, l, k-1\rangle \underset{(3+2i+2j+2l)k+\frac{k(k-1)}{2}}{\overset{3+2i+2j+2l+k-1}{\rightleftharpoons}} |uds, i, j, l, k\rangle \tag{4.7}$$

$$\frac{\rho_{i,j,l,k}}{\rho_{i,j,l,k-1}} = \frac{3+2i+2j+2l+k-1}{3+2i+2j+2l)k+\frac{k(k-1)}{2}} \tag{4.8}$$

3. When $g \Leftrightarrow q\overline{q}$ is considered: The processes $g \Leftrightarrow u\overline{u}$, $g \Leftrightarrow d\overline{d}$, $g \Leftrightarrow s\overline{s}$ are involved here.

$$\frac{\rho_{i,j,l,k}}{\rho_{i,j,l+k,0}} = \frac{(k(k-1)(k-2).....1(1-C_0)^{n-2l-1}(1-C_1)^{n-2l}....(1-C_{l-1})^{n+k-2}}{(l+1)(l+2)....(l+k)(l+k+1)} \tag{4.9}$$

The details of the above calculations can be found in ref. [35]. The subprocess $g \Leftrightarrow s\overline{s}$ is active only when they satisfy the condition that gluons should have energy larger than at least two times the mass of strange quark because strange quark has non-negligible mass for gluons to undergo the process. The subprocess $g \Leftrightarrow s\overline{s}$ is restricted by applying the constraint defined as $k(1-C_l)^{n-1}$ [34] which is introduced from gluon free energy distribution. Here, n is the number of partons present in the Fock state i.e n=3+2i+2j+l+2k in our calculations. So taking $(1-C_l)^{n-1}$ as the suppressing factor for generating $s\overline{s}$ pairs from a gluon and by using the detailed balance model the strange quark contribution to the baryon can be calculated. The value of number of $s\overline{s}$ pairs has been restricted to two due to its large mass and limited free energy of gluon undergoing the subprocess $q \Leftrightarrow s\overline{s}$. Detailed balance principle when applied to different baryons gives different results because sea content will split and recombine with quark content which is different for every baryon.

The expressions of probabilities in terms of $\rho_{0,0,0,0}$ for Σ^{*0}:

$$\frac{\rho_{i,j,l+k,0}}{\rho_{0,0,0,0}} = \frac{1}{i!(i+1)!j!(j+1)!(l+k)!(l+k+1)!} \tag{4.10}$$

Similar expressions of probabilities for other decuplet particles can be written in terms of $\rho_{0,0,0,0}$ and are shown below in table 2. The normalization condition $\sum_{i,j,k,l} \rho_{i,j,k,l} = 1$ gives the individual probabilities of baryon decuplets. The entire list of probabilities of various Fock states i.e $\rho_{i,j,k,l}$'s are shown in table 3 for other decuplet members as well.

Baryon	$\frac{\rho_{i,j,l+k,0}}{\rho_{0,0,0,0}}$
Δ^{++}	$\frac{3}{i!(i+3)!j!j!(l+k)!(l+k)!}$
Δ^{+}	$\frac{2}{i!(i+2)!j!(j+1)!(l+k)!(l+k)!}$
Δ^{0}	$\frac{2}{i!(i+1)!j!(j+2)!(l+k)!(l+k)!}$
Δ^{-}	$\frac{3}{i!i!j!(j+3)!(l+k)!(l+k)!}$
Σ^{*+}	$\frac{2}{i!(i+1)!j!(j+1)!(l+k)!(l+k+1)!}$
Σ^{*0}	$\frac{1}{i!(i+1)!j!(j+1)!(l+k)!(l+k+1)!}$
Σ^{*-}	$\frac{2}{i!i!j!(j+2)!(l+k)!(l+k+1)!}$
Ξ^{*0}	$\frac{2}{i!(i+1)!j!j!(l+k)!(l+k+2)!}$
Ξ^{*-}	$\frac{2}{i!i!j!(j+1)!(l+k)!(l+k+2)!}$
Ω^{-}	$\frac{3}{i!i!j!j!(l+k)!(l+k+3)!}$

Table 2: Expressions for probabilities in terms of $\rho_{0,0,0,0}$ for $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^+$ decuplet:

i	j	L	$\rho_{i,j,k,l}$	k=0	k=1	k=2
0	0	0	uds	0.15454	0.0992203	0.00599579
0	0	1	uds $s\overline{s}$	0.07727	0.0324754	0.00910211
0	1	0	uds $d\overline{d}$	0.07727	0.0369213	0.00157739
1	0	0	uds $u\overline{u}$	0.07727	0.0369213	0.00157739
0	1	1	uds $d\overline{d}s\overline{s}$	0.038635	0.01148	0.00321758
1	0	1	uds $u\overline{u}s\overline{s}$	0.038635	0.01148	0.00321758
1	1	0	uds $u\overline{u}d\overline{d}$	0.038635	0.013739	0.000414987
1	1	1	uds $u\overline{u}d\overline{d}s\overline{s}$	0.0193175	0.00405816	0.00113741
1	2	0	uds $u\overline{u}d\overline{d}d\overline{d}$	0.00643917	0.00170415	0.0000363921
0	2	0	uds $d\overline{d}d\overline{d}$	0.0128783	0.00457965	0.000138329
0	2	1	uds $d\overline{d}d\overline{d}s\overline{s}$	0.00643917	0.00135272	0.000379137
2	0	0	uds $u\overline{u}u\overline{u}$	0.0128783	0.00457965	0.000138329
2	1	0	uds $u\overline{u}d\overline{d}$	0.00643917	0.00170415	0.0000363921
2	0	1	uds $u\overline{u}u\overline{u}s\overline{s}$	0.00643917	0.00135272	0.000379137

Table 3: The values of probabilities of all Fock states i.e $\rho_{i,j,k,l}$'s.

From the table 3, it is well observed that lesser contributions from higher mass Fock states have suppressed the whole Fock states with higher mass and SU(2) symmetry is well obeyed by Fock states with u and d quarks. The number of $s\overline{s}$ pairs have been limited to two because of heavy strange quark mass and limited free energy of gluon as strange-antistrange pairs are generated from subprocess $g \Leftrightarrow s\overline{s}$.

Statistical model [36] is used in our formalism to calculate magnetic moments of decuplet members by assuming hadrons as an ensemble of quark gluon Fock states. We statistically decompose quark-gluon Fock states $|q^3, i, j, k, l\rangle$ of a baryon in a set of states in which the valence part and sea have definite spin and color quantum number. Statistical model has earlier been applied to proton [36], assumes the baryon comprises of valence quarks plus a virtual sea consisting of strange/non-strange quark antiquark pairs multiconnected through gluons in the form of subprocesses like $g \Leftrightarrow q\overline{q}$,$g \Leftrightarrow gg$,$q \Leftrightarrow qg$.

The wave function in equation (2.3) can also be written in the form of $\Phi_{val}\Phi_{sea}$ and the unknown parameters $(a_0, b_1, b_8, d_1, d_8)$ by a factor $\sum n^*_{\mu\nu}c_{sea}$ such that total wave function becomes $|\Phi^{\uparrow}_{\frac{3}{2}}\rangle = \sum_{\mu,\nu}(n^*_{\mu\nu}c_{sea})\Phi_{val}\Phi_{sea}$ where μ and ν have values 0, 1, 2 and 1, 8, $\overline{10}$ respectively. All $n'_{\mu,\nu}s$ are calculated from multiplicities of each Fock state in spin and color space. These multiplicities are expressed in the form of $\rho_{p,q}$ where relative probability for core part should have angular momentum p and sea to have angular momentum q such that the resultant angular momentum should come out as 3/2. Similar probabilities could be calculated for color space which yields color singlet state. Calculation of these probabilities are expressed in the form of common factor ("c") for every combination of valence and sea which is multiplied with multiplicity factor (n) for each Fock state. The common parameter "c" can be calculated from the table of various Fock states derived from the principle of detailed balance. Each unknown parameter in the equation of wave function will have a particular value of $\sum n_{\mu\nu}c_{sea}$ depending on the Fock state: [37]

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_0 &= (n_{01}c_{sea})_{|gg\rangle} + (n_{01}c_{sea})_{|u\overline{u}g\rangle} + (n_{01}c_{sea})_{|d\overline{d}g\rangle} + (n_{01}c_{sea})_{|s\overline{s}g\rangle} + ... \\
b_1 &= (n_{11}c_{sea})_{|gg\rangle} + (n_{11}c_{sea})_{|u\overline{u}g\rangle} + (n_{11}c_{sea})_{|d\overline{d}g\rangle} + (n_{11}c_{sea})_{|s\overline{s}g\rangle} + ... \\
d_1 &= (n_{21}c_{sea})_{|gg\rangle} + (n_{21}c_{sea})_{|u\overline{u}g\rangle} + (n_{21}c_{sea})_{|d\overline{d}g\rangle} + (n_{21}c_{sea})_{|s\overline{s}g\rangle} + ... \\
&.....
\end{aligned}
$$

Combinations for other unknown parameters can be written in a similar way. Though the set of different Fock states $(|gg\rangle, |u\overline{u}g\rangle, |d\overline{d}g\rangle)$ etc. is same for all baryon decuplet members but the probability distribution is different for different baryons due to mass inherited from flavor leading to different values of unknown parameters. These calculations will give the value of a factor "nc" for Fock states which has a significant role in determining the magnetic moments. The subscripts s and a denotes symmetry and anti-symmetry conditions. To find ratio of probabilities in spin and color space, various decompositions are carried out in a way:

1. Consider the decomposition of state $|q^3,0,0,0,2\rangle$ or $|gg\rangle$ sea: Different cases of probability ratios for spin of valence and sea can be written as:

$$\frac{\rho_{\frac{1}{2},1}}{\rho_{\frac{1}{2},1}} = \frac{(\frac{3}{8}).(\frac{3}{9}).(\frac{1}{6})}{(\frac{3}{8}).(\frac{5}{9}).(\frac{2}{10})} = \frac{1}{2}$$
$$\frac{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},0}}{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},1}} = \frac{(\frac{1}{8}).(\frac{1}{9}).(\frac{1}{4})}{(\frac{1}{8}).(\frac{3}{9}).(\frac{1}{8})} = 2$$
$$\frac{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},0}}{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},2}} = \frac{(\frac{1}{8}).(\frac{1}{9}).(\frac{1}{4})}{(\frac{1}{8}).(\frac{5}{9}).(\frac{1}{10})} = \frac{1}{2}$$

where $\rho_{p,q}$ is the probability that the q^3 valence and gg sea are in spin states p and q respectively which combine to give total spin as 3/2. The first term on the r.h.s in the numerator or denominator denotes the relative probability for valence quarks to have spin p and second term is for spin of sea (q) and finally, third term denotes the resultant spin 3/2. Similar probability ratios can be calculated for color spaces finally giving a color singlet baryon and can be written as:

$$\frac{\rho_{1,1}}{\rho_{8,8_s}} = \frac{(\frac{1}{27}).(\frac{1}{64}).(1)}{(\frac{16}{27}).(\frac{8}{64}).(\frac{1}{64})} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{\rho_{1,1}}{\rho_{8,8_a}}$$
$$\frac{\rho_{1,1}}{\rho_{10,\overline{10}}} = \frac{(\frac{1}{27}).(\frac{1}{64}).(1)}{(\frac{10}{27}).(\frac{10}{64}).(\frac{1}{100})} = 1$$

So, these are the probability distributions to find the valence quarks in spin 3/2 and color singlet states with sea. To compute the common parameter "c" the product of probabilities in spin and color spaces can be written in terms of common factor "c" as;

$$\rho_{\frac{1}{2},1}[\rho_{8,8_a},\rho_{10,\overline{10}}] = c(2,1)$$
$$\rho_{\frac{1}{2},2}[\rho_{1,1},\rho_{8,8_s}] = 2c(1,2)$$
$$\rho_{\frac{3}{2},0}[\rho_{1,1},\rho_{8,8_s}] = 2c(1,2)$$
$$\rho_{\frac{3}{2},1}[\rho_{8,8_a}] = 2c$$
$$\rho_{\frac{3}{2},2}[\rho_{1,1},\rho_{8,8_s}] = 2c(1,2)$$

Values present on the r.h.s of the above equations are the multiplicities for a particular Fock state. There is no contribution from $H_0G_{\overline{10}}$, H_1G_1 and $H_2G_{\overline{10}}$ as they form an antisymmetric sea under the exchange of two gluons which makes these wave functions antisymmetric and therefore unacceptable for a bosonic system (gg). Equating the sum of all these partial probabilities to value of probabilities ρ_{0002}, ρ_{2000}, ρ_{0200} taken from table 3 for Σ^{*0} gives the unknown parameter c as: 23c = 0.00599579 , c_{0002}= 0.0002606865217 and other values can be computed and written as c_{2000}= 0.000559926087, c_{0200}= 0.000559926087. Similar decompositions can be done for other Fock states as well i.e by taking the sea upto three gluons as shown in tables below.

Probability Ratio → States ↓	$\frac{\rho_{\frac{1}{2},1}}{\rho_{\frac{1}{2},2}}$	$\frac{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},0}}{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},1}}$	$\frac{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},0}}{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},2}}$	$\frac{\rho_{1,1}}{\rho_{8,8}}$	$\frac{\rho_{1,1}}{\rho_{10,\overline{10}}}$
$\|gg\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1
$\|u\overline{u}g\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1
$\|d\overline{d}g\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1
$\|s\overline{s}g\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1
$\|u\overline{u}d\overline{d}\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1
$\|u\overline{u}s\overline{s}\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1
$\|s\overline{s}d\overline{d}\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1
$\|d\overline{d}d\overline{d}\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1
$\|u\overline{u}u\overline{u}\rangle$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1

Table 4: Computed probability ratios for various Fock states in spin and color space.

Probability Ratio → States ↓	$\frac{\rho_{\frac{1}{2},1}}{\rho_{\frac{1}{2},2}}$ S,A	$\frac{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},1}}{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},2}}$ S,A	$\frac{\rho_{\frac{1}{2},1}}{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},1}}$ S,A	$\frac{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},1}}{\rho_{\frac{3}{2},0}}$ S,A	$\frac{\rho_{1,1}}{\rho_{8,8}}$ S,A	$\frac{\rho_{1,1}}{\rho_{10,\overline{10}}}$ S,A
$\|d\overline{d}d\overline{d}g\rangle$	$1,\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3}$	3	$\frac{1}{8},\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}$
$\|d\overline{d}s\overline{s}g\rangle$	$1,\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3}$	3	$\frac{1}{8},\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}$
$\|u\overline{u}gg\rangle$	$1,\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3}$	3	$\frac{1}{8},\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}$
$\|d\overline{d}gg\rangle$	$1,\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3}$	3	$\frac{1}{8},\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}$
$\|s\overline{s}gg\rangle$	$1,\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3}$	3	$\frac{1}{8},\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}$
$\|u\overline{u}u\overline{u}g\rangle$	$1,\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2},\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3}$	3	$\frac{1}{8},\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}$
$\|u\overline{u}d\overline{d}g\rangle$(no symmetry condition)	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{9}{8}$	-	$\frac{9}{2}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2}$

Table 5: Computed probability ratios for various Fock states in spin and color space.

4.1 Modifications in statistical model

Statistical model and detailed balance principle is used in combination to study the properties like magnetic moment and $\overline{d}-\overline{u}$ asymmetry, vector and scalar dominancy in the sea and strange quark importance to the magnetic moment of decuplets. There are three modification in specific, that we have focussed upon, and they are discussed below.

Model D assumes, that sea containing large number of gluons have relatively smaller probabilities and hence their multiplicities have been suppressed over the rest of valence particles with limited quarks. In order to check the predicting power of statistical approach, we have modified the relative probabilities by suppressing the contribution of states coming from higher multiplicities. Here relative probabilities are divided with their respective spin and color multiplicities to achieve the suppression. This modification is based on the phenomenological ground [37] stating, that the higher the multiplicities, lower will be the associated probabilities. The decompositions of Fock states with this new input is shown as:

1. $|gq\overline{q}\rangle, |u\overline{u}d\overline{d}\rangle, |u\overline{u}s\overline{s}\rangle, |d\overline{d}s\overline{s}\rangle$ sea , symmetry consideration is not needed.

$$\rho_{\frac{1}{2},1}[\rho_{1,1},\rho_{8,8},\rho_{10,\overline{10}}] = c(1,4,1) = d(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{48},\frac{1}{300})$$
$$\rho_{\frac{1}{2},2}[\rho_{1,1},\rho_{8,8},\rho_{10,\overline{10}}] = 2c(1,4,1) = 2d(\frac{1}{5},\frac{1}{80},\frac{1}{500})$$
$$\rho_{\frac{3}{2},0}[\rho_{1,1},\rho_{8,8},\rho_{10,\overline{10}}] = c(1,4,1) = d(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{32},\frac{1}{200})$$
$$\rho_{\frac{3}{2},1}[\rho_{8,8}] = 4c = \frac{d}{96}$$
$$\rho_{\frac{3}{2},2}[\rho_{1,1},\rho_{8,8},\rho_{10,\overline{10}}] = 2c(1,4,1) = 2d(\frac{1}{10},\frac{1}{160},\frac{1}{1000})$$

Summing and equating all the partial probabilities to $\rho_{1001},\rho_{0101},\rho_{0011},\rho_{1100},\rho_{1010},\rho_{0110}$ we get values of d as: 0.01069737, 0.01069737, 0.044775695, 0.022387718, 0.022387718, 0.022387718 respectively. All the calculations of relative probability $\rho_{p,q}$ for spin and color spaces with the possibilities arising from gluons are shown in table below. Similar numbers can be obtained for other Fock states as well. Details of the calculations is given in Ref. [37].

Detailed balance principle is applied to put a limit on the number of $s\overline{s}$ pairs in the sea (due to the fixed mass of decuplets), in terms of constraint as $(1-C_l)^{n-1}$ where $C_l = \frac{2M_s}{M_B-2lM_s}$ (M_B=mass of baryon, M_s=mass of strange quark, n is the total number of partons. This kind of constraint is proven to be helpful to understand the strange behavior of the sea in various decuplets. It has been noticed in general that, the strange sea dominates over non-strange sea quarks for strange baryon particles $(\Sigma^{*+},\Sigma^{*0},\Sigma^{*-},\Xi^{*0},\Xi^{*-},\Omega^{-})$ as compared to non strange decuplet members $(\Delta^{++},\Delta^{+},\Delta^{0},\Delta^{-})$.

To appreciate the importance of sea with spin, modifications in the model is done by choosing sea to be contributing through scalar, vector or tensor coefficients. Here sea with spin 0,1,2 are called

scalar, vector and tensor sea respectively. These coefficients are directly related to probabilities of quark-gluon Fock states in spin color and flavor space. Here sea is found to be dynamic for scalar and tensor part unlike baryon octets where tensor appears to be less dominating due to quark spin flip processes [38]. In specific, magnetic moments get influenced by suppressing any of the parameter/coefficient in the total wavefunction.

The importance of SU(3) symmetry and its breaking has been discussed for baryon octets [38]. Due to the limited experimental information on SU(3)symmetry breaking in decuplets, we have restricted ourselves to analyse $\overline{d}-\overline{u}$ asymmetry contributing to the magnetic moment of decuplets. These data may be useful for experimentalist to investigate further.

Due to the variation in the individual contributions coming from sea containing either $u\overline{u}, d\overline{d}$ and $s\overline{s}$ pairs motivates us to study the $\overline{d}-\overline{u}$ asymmetry in the valence and sea quarks. The anti-quark flavor asymmetry $\overline{d}-\overline{u}$ is calculated for all baryon decuplets to justify their importance in the sea. The set of experiments like SLAC in 1975 [39], E288 collaboration with Drell-Yan experiment at Fermilab in 1981 [40], HERMES collaboration at DESY [41-43] have been successful in measuring $\overline{d}-\overline{u}$ asymmetry over a period of time. On phenomenological grounds, meson cloud model and chiral quark model have also been able to confirm the values observed experimentally. Also, Zhang et al. have used principle of detailed balance to calculate flavor asymmetry and predicted the value as 0.118 [43] matching well with experimental value of 0.124 [42].

5 Results and Discussion

Magnetic moments of baryon decuplets are calculated in statistical model in which the hadronic structure is considered to be consisting of valence quarks and sea limited to few number of quarks and gluon states multiconnected non perturbatively through gluons. The calculation of magnetic moments are performed by two approaches i.e. Model C and Model D. Model C aims at finding relative probabilities of the Fock states in color, spin and flavor space whereas Model D finds the probabilities of Fock states by suppressing the contribution of states with higher multiplicities. The conclusions of this approach are as follows:

- Magnetic moments of decuplets are shown in table 6. The results are based on a combined approach of statistical model and detailed balance principle. The experimental information on magnetic moment of $\Delta^{++}, \Delta^{+}, \Omega^{-}$ [46-48] are very well retrieved with our approach other moments are compared with the theoretical data and found to be matching well within the error bar 10-20%. C model is showing better match than the D model where suppressed multiplicity are used to calculate relative probabilities. Further modification in C model leads to the following conditions. The modification is done in terms of assumptions where sea can be strange or non-strange quark-gluon Fock states.

- It can be concluded that probability of strange sea is more in strange particles as compared

to non strange ones. The reason being that strange quarks contribute very less as compared to up and down quarks which are lighter than heavy (strange) quarks. Here, the importance of constraint applied in the procedure can be justified as:

Fock state	Value of constraint $(1 - C_l)^{n-1}$
uds $u\overline{u}s\overline{s}g$	0.271
uss $u\overline{u}s\overline{s}g$	0.317

The data clearly shows the more importance of constraint on doubly strange baryon than single strange baryon for one $s\overline{s}$ pair in sea.

- Along with this, the effect of suppressing the contribution from scalar, vector and tensor sea has also been estimated separately. Table 7 shows the contributions from scalar-tensor and vector sea. Individual contributions from scalar, vector and tensor sea was checked which concluded that scalar-tensor sea gives a good match with the observed values in our model. Vector sea contributions was suppressed to check the contributions from the scalar-tensor sea and similarly other contributions could be calculated. So, scalar-tensor sea dominance is confirmed to produce results closer to experimental data.

- The $\overline{d}-\overline{u}$ asymmetry is calculated for the decuplet particles using principle of detailed balance and is shown in table 7.

- Besides this, the value magnetic moment ratio $\frac{\mu(\Delta^{++})}{\mu(p)} = 1.97$ is in good agreement with the prediction of simple quark model i.e. $\frac{\mu(\Delta^{++})}{\mu(p)} = 2.0$ and experimentally the ratio is predicted to be 1.62$\pm$0.18 . Interestingly, our value of $\frac{\mu(\Omega^{-})}{\mu(\Lambda^{0})} = 2.98$ also matches with the predicted value by simple quark model equal to 3.

- Our model has been able to produce excellent fit to the sum rules given by Soon-Tae Hong [49] for baryon decuplet magnetic moments i.e

$$\mu_{\Sigma^{*0}} = \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\Sigma^{*+}} + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\Sigma^{*-}}$$
$$\mu_{\Delta^{-}} + \mu_{\Delta^{++}} = \mu_{\Delta^{0}} + \mu_{\Delta^{+}}$$

Particle	C Model	D Model	SQM	QCDQM[17]	χQM[44]	CQSM[22]	CBM[45]	Data
Δ^{++}	5.50	4.82	5.56	5.689	5.30	4.85	4.52	4.52±0.50 [46]
Δ^{+}	2.69	2.36	2.73	2.778	2.58	2.35	2.12	$2.7^{+1.0}_{-1.3} \pm 1.5 \pm 3$[47]
Δ^{0}	-0.09	-0.13	-0.09	-0.134	-0.13	-0.14	-0.29	-
Δ^{-}	-2.88	-2.52	-2.92	-3.045	-2.85	-2.63	-2.69	-
Σ^{*+}	3.05	2.93	3.09	2.933	2.88	2.47	2.63	-
Σ^{*0}	0.26	0.22	0.27	0.137	0.17	-0.02	0.08	-
Σ^{*-}	-2.53	-2.23	-2.56	-2.659	-2.55	-2.52	-2.48	-
Ξ^{*0}	0.61	0.47	0.63	0.424	0.47	0.09	0.44	-
Ξ^{*-}	-2.16	-1.84	-2.31	-2.307	-2.25	-2.40	-2.27	-
Ω^{-}	-1.82	-1.67	-1.84	-1.970	-1.95	-2.29	-2.06	-2.02±0.05[48]

Table 6: Comparison of computed magnetic moments (in terms of μ_N) of baryon decuplet with other models and experimental data.

Particle	C model		$\overline{d}-\overline{u}$ asymmetry	Vector sea	Scalar-Tensor sea	Data
	With strange sea ($g \to u\overline{u}, d\overline{d}, s\overline{s}$)	Without $s\overline{s}$ sea (only $g \to u\overline{u}, d\overline{d}$)				
Δ^{++}	5.50	5.51	0.4	4.07	5.50	4.52±0.50
Δ^{+}	2.69	2.70	0.12	2.003	2.70	$2.7^{+1.0}_{-1.3} \pm 1.5 \pm 3$
Δ^{0}	-0.09	-0.09	-0.12	-0.067	-0.096	-
Δ^{-}	-2.88	-2.89	-0.4	-2.13	-2.88	-
Σ^{*+}	3.05	3.01	0	2.26	3.05	-
Σ^{*0}	0.26	0.26	0	0.19	0.26	-
Σ^{*-}	-2.53	-2.51	-0.37	-1.87	-2.53	-
Ξ^{*0}	0.61	0.59	0.26	0.45	0.61	-
Ξ^{*-}	-2.16	-2.11	-0.26	-1.61	-2.17	-
Ω^{-}	-1.82	-1.71	0	-1.34	-1.82	-2.02±0.05

Table 7: Various modifications in Statistical Model

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support by the Department of Science and Technology (SB/FTP/PS-037/2014), New Delhi.

1. S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 252002 (2012); S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS Collaboration), JHEP 07, 163 (2013).

2. S. Coleman and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 6, 423(1961).

3. K. A. Olive et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, 38, 090001 (2014).

4. A. Bosshard, C. Amsler, M. Doebeli, M. Doser, M. Schaad, J. Riedlberger, P. Truoel and J. A. Bistirlich et al., Phys. Rev. D 44, 1962 (1991).

5. H. T. Diehl, S. Teige, G. B. Thomson, Y. Zou, C. James, K. B. Luk, R. Rameika and P. M. Ho et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 804 (1991).

6. N. B. Wallace, P.M. Border, D. P. Ciampa, G. Guglielmo, K. J. Heller, D. M. Woods, K. A. Johns and Y. T. Gao et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3732 (1995).

7. M.Kotulla et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 272001 (2002).

8. I.V. Gorelov (CDF Collaboration) arXiv:hep-ex/0701056,(2007).

9. J. Ashman, et al.,(EMC Collaboration) Phys. Lett. B 206 (1988) 364.

10. B. Adeva et al. (SMC Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 58, 112001 (1998).

11. X. Song, V. Gupta, Phys. Rev. D. 49 , 2211-2220, (1994).

12. H. Dahiya and M. Gupta, Phys. Rev. D 67, 114015 (2003).

13. M.D. Slaughter, Phys. Rev. C 82, 015208 (2010); M.D. Slaughter, Phys. Rev. D 84, 071303 (2011);J. Linde, T. Ohlsson, and H. Snellman, Phys. Rev. D 57, 452 (1998); J. Linde, T. Ohlsson, and H. Snellman, Phys. Rev. D 57, 5916 (1998).

14. I.S. Sogami and Oh'Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 2295.

15. B. S. Bains and R. C. Verma, Phys. Rev. D 66, 114008 (2002).

16. F. Schlumpf, Phys. Rev. D 48, 4478 (1993); G. Ramalho, K. Tsushima, and F. Gross, Phys. Rev. D 80, 033004 (2009).

17. P.Ha, Phys. Rev. D 58, 113003 (1998); C.S. An, Q.B. Li, D.O. Riska, and B.S. Zou, Phys. Rev. C 74, 055205 (2006).

18. B.S. Bains and R.C. Verma, Phys. Rev D 66, 114008 (2002); R. Dhir and R.C. Verma, Eur. Phys. J. A 42, 243 (2009).

19. T.M. Aliev, A. Ozpineci, and M. Savci, Phys. Rev. D 62, 053012 (2000).

20. F.X. Lee, Phys. Rev. D 57, 1801 (1998); S.L. Zhu, W.Y.P. Hwang, and Z.S.P. Yang, Phys. Rev. D 57, 1527 (1998); A. Iqubal, M. Dey, and J. Dey, Phys. Lett. B 477, 125 (2000).

21. B. Schwesinger and H. Weigel, Nucl. Phys. A 540, 461 (1992); Y. Oh, Phys. Rev. D 75, 074002 (2007).

22. T. Ledwig, A. Silva, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev D 79 094025 (2009). ;H-C. Kim, M. Praszalowicz, and K. Goeke, Phys. Rev. D 57, 2859 (1998); G.S. Yang, H-C. Kim, M. Praszalowicz, and K. Goeke, Phys. Rev. D 70, 114002 (2004). ;R. Flores-Mendieta, Phys. Rev. D 80, 094014 (2009); L.S. Geng, J.M. Camalich, and M.J.V. Vacas, Phys. Rev D 80, 034027 (2009).

23. R. Flores-Mendieta, Phys. Rev. D 80, 094014 (2009); L.S. Geng, J.M. Camalich, and M.J.V. Vacas, Phys. Rev D 80, 034027 (2009).

24. S. Boinepalli, D.B. Leinweber, P.J. Moran, A.G.Williams, J.M. Zanotti, and J.B. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D 80, 054505 (2009); C. Aubin, K. Orginos, V. Pascalutsa, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. D 79, 051502 (2009); P.E. Shanahan et al. (CSSMand QCDSF/UKQCD Collaborations), Phys. Rev. D 89, 074511 (2014).

25. F. X. Lee, R. Kelly, L. Zhou and W. Wilcox, Phys. Lett. B 627, 71 (2005).

26. A.O. Bazarko et al., Z.Phys. C65 (1995) 189-198.

27. A. Acha, et al., HAPPEX Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98 (2007) 032301.

28. S. Baunack, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 102 (2009) 151803.

29. D. Androic, et al., G0 Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104 (2010) 012001.

30. R. Bijker, et al., Phys. Rev. C 85 (2012) 035204.

31. J. F. Donoghue and E. Golowich, Phys. Rev. D 15, 3421 (1977);He Hanxin, Zhang Xizhen, and Zhuo Yizhong, Chinese Phys. 4, 359 (1984).

32. E. Golowich, E. Haqq, and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. D 2, 160 (1983); F. E. Close and Z. Li, Phys. Rev. D 42, 2194 1990; F. E. Close, Rep. Prog. Phys. 51, 833 (1988); Z. Li, Phys. Rev. D 44, 2841 (1991).

33. Y.J. Zhang, W.Z. Deng, B.Q. Ma, Phys. Lett. B 523 (2002) 260; Y.J. Zhang, B.Q. Ma, L. Yang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 18 (2003) 14651468.

34. Y.J. Zhang, B. Zhang, B.Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. D 65 (2002) 114005.

35. M.Batra, A.Upadhyay, Int.J.Mod.Phys. A28 (2013) 1350062.

36. J. P. Singh, A. Upadhyay, J. Phys. G, Nucl. Part. Phys. 30 (2004) 881894.

37. A. Upadhyay, M. Batra, The European Physical Journal A, (2013).

38. M. Batra et al. J.Phys.Conf.Ser. 481 (2014) 012024.

39. S.Stein et al., Phys. Rev D 12,1884(1975).

40. A. S. Ito et al.[E288 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 23,604(1981).

41. E. A. Hawker et al.,Phys. Rev. Lett. 80,3715(1998);J. C. Peng et al.,Phys. Rev. D 58,092004(1998).

42. R. S. Towell et al.,Phys. Rev. D 64,052004(2001).

43. Y.J. Zhang, B. Zhang, B.Q Ma, Phys. Lett. B524, 260 (2001).

44. J. Linde, T. Ohlsson, and H. Snellman, Phys. Rev. D 57, 452 (1998); J. Linde, T. Ohlsson, and H. Snellman, Phys. Rev. D 57, 5916 (1998).

45. S-T. Hong, Phys. Rev. D 76, 094029 (2007).

46. A.Bossard et al., Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 1962.

47. M. Kotulla et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 272001 (2002).

48. K.A. Olive et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, 38, 090001 (2014).

49. S.T. Hong, G. E. Brown, Nuclear Physics A580 (1994) 408-418.


C Model
D Model
Experiment
Δ++
Δ+
Ω−
Δ++
Σ*+
Δ+
Ξ*0
Σ*0
Δ0
Ω−
Ξ*-
Σ*-
Δ−
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.5
3.0
6
4
2
-2